



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,400	08/12/2002	Kunio Kawaguchi	450101-03365	4955
20999 7590 01/21/2009 FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			EXAMINER HAMZA, FARUK	
			ART UNIT 2455	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/21/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/089,400	Applicant(s) KAWAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner FARUK HAMZA	Art Unit 2455	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 14-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on November 11, 2008. Claims 1, 5, 14 and 17 have been amended. Claims 6-13 have been canceled. Claims 1-5 and 14-19 are pending.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The claim limitation “computer-readable medium” requires proper antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1, 5, 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the examiner whether the applicant referring to the predetermined operation by the newly added limitation "each operation" or to any other operation. It is also unclear to the examiner what applicant meant by “upon execution of a *specific operation instruction*”. Claims 2-4, 15-16 and 18-19 have same deficiency of their base claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1-5 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the U. S. Patent No. 7,039,599, issued to Merriman et al., hereinafter Merriman.

Regarding claim 1, Merriman teaches an information picture utilization apparatus comprising:

a client apparatus for sending notification regarding recording of an information picture (4:14-30 - feedback loop 23 (Fig.1) provides notification of recording of information picture (Fig. 2, step 36)); and

a server apparatus for receiving the notification regarding the recording of the information picture (4:66-67 and 5:1-6 - advertisement and predictive model servers),

wherein the client apparatus sends information for specifying the information picture by utilizing picture information and related information (4:31-43 - feedback information),

wherein the information for specifying the information picture causes a predetermined operation to be processed as a single unit when an operation command is given (4:44-49 - automatic update of ad delivery monitoring database), and

wherein the predetermined operation is one or more instructions, each operation processed in accordance with the related information upon execution of a specific operation instruction (3:13-36, 4:45-59).

Regarding claim 2, Merriman teaches the information picture utilization apparatus as set forth in claim 1, wherein said information picture includes time limit information in said related information; and said client inhibits execution of the notification to the server by interpreting said time limit information (4:49-53 - execution is limited by time period).

Regarding claim 3, Merriman teaches the information picture utilization apparatus as set forth in claim 1, wherein said information picture includes time limit information in said related information; and said client inhibits execution of a predetermined operation by interpreting said time limit information (4:49-53).

Regarding claim 4, Merriman teaches the information picture utilization apparatus as set forth in claim 1, wherein said client inhibits execution of the notification to the server on the basis of operation history based on the information picture (4:49-53).

Regarding claim 5, Merriman teaches an information picture utilization apparatus comprising:

a client apparatus for sending a notification regarding recording of an information picture (4:14-30 - feedback loop 23 (Fig.1) provides notification of recording of information picture (Fig. 2, step 36)); and

a server apparatus for receiving the notification regarding the recording of the information picture (4:66-67 and 5:1-6 - advertisement and predictive model servers),

wherein the information picture is sent and recorded into said server apparatus by utilizing picture information and related information (4:31-43 - feedback information), and

wherein the utilization of the picture information and the related information causes a predetermined operation to be processed as a single unit when an operation command is given independent of a period of time (4:44-49 - automatic update of ad delivery monitoring database).

Regarding claim 14, Merriman teaches an information picture management apparatus for carrying out management of an information picture in which picture information and related information for prescribing at least peculiar processing are caused to be one handling unit, which is delivered to an information terminal connected through network, wherein said information picture management apparatus comprises: a registration information recording unit for recording registration information relating to information picture delivered to the information terminal and registered (4:31-43 and Fig. 1, database 20 is recording registration information relating to information picture - banner ads served);

Art Unit: 2455

an updating permission/negation unit for determining permission/negation of updating with respect to information picture caused to undergo management by the registration information in accordance with updating condition set in advance (4:44-53 - pre-sets on direct advertising campaigns that are set in advance); and an information picture updating unit for updating processing with respect to information picture determined to be permitted by the updating permission/negation section (4:49-53 - banner serving criteria).

Regarding claim 15, Merriman teaches the information picture management apparatus as set forth in claim 14, wherein information pictures within the range from the number where at least one of registration and updating of the information picture is approximately a time up to a predetermined number should be updated as the updating condition (5:14-27).

Regarding claim 16, Merriman teaches the information picture management apparatus as set forth in claim 15, wherein predetermined numbers are set with respect to respective ones of plural information terminals, and are changed in accordance with change instructions from the information terminals (5:14-27).

Claims 17-19 are rejected in view of the above rejection of claims 14-16. Claims 17-19 are essentially the same as claims 14-16, respectively, except that they set forth the invention as a computer program product rather than an apparatus, as do claims 14-16.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks applicant argues in substance that; A) The specification provides support for claim limitation "computer-readable medium".

In response to A) The examiner respectfully disagree. The applicant's specification/abstract failed to provide support for such limitation. The applicant is encouraged to provide specific section of the specification for support. Therefore, the objection to the specification is maintained.

B) Merriman does not teach the claim limitation "the predetermined operation is one or more instructions, each operation processed in accordance with the related information upon execution of a specific operation instruction".

In response to B) The claim language failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant is reminded that claim limitation must be given their reasonable broadest interpretation. The claim language merely recites "predetermined operation", "instruction". It failed to define or provide any details of these limitations. Merriman teaches dynamically replacing or disabling the distribution of advertisements based on certain criteria (see Column 3, lines 13-36, Column 4, lines 45-59) . The examiner is broadly interpreting this to be "the predetermined operation is one or more instructions, each operation processed in accordance with the related information upon execution of a specific operation instruction". Therefore, teaching of Merriman meets the claim limitation.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faruk Hamza whose telephone number is 571-272-7969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2455

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 886-217-9197 (toll –free).


Faruk Hamza

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unite 2455

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2455

<div>Application Number</div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/089,400	KAWAGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FARUK HAMZA	2455	